



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/596,457

06/14/2006

Marc Andre Peters

NL031487

6887

24737

7590

06/24/2010

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

YU, XIANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2445

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/24/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Advisory Action Continued

With regards to the newly amended claims, the applicant's representative has now placed more emphasis upon the terms of "broadcast driven group of peers." In view of the specifications found on page 4, lines 17-18, the broadcast driven group of peers is simply a group of peers within a p2p community driven or fueled by a goal or interest in mind. The peers are enabled to interact via the P2P network within the context of the broadcast. While, the applicant's remarks and specification go on and further define how these groups thus form their "virtual private network that improves the scalability by routing messages only through members of that group and not to all the peers on the network," this idea is not clearly reflected within the claim language. There is no sense of exclusivity or private messaging within the group members. The claim language should be further amended to better convey that meaning and purpose.

Applicant's representative has also stated that Goldman's disclosure of an EPG with identifiers does not equate to "...deriving a specific identifier from a further identifier,..." to which the examiner disagrees. The act of "deriving" is vague and indefinite and can be easily and readily interpreted as a form of "extracting" a (first) specific identifier from a (second) further identifier. Now, since *Goldman* clearly discloses of an EPG with multiple various identifiers for linking content data and/or individuals (e.g., *Goldman*: column 6, lines 55-60 and column 9, lines 44-49, and column 11, lines 23-43), it should be clear that a user can derive or extract some information from an identifier or tag and get a further identifier or tag.

Art Unit: 2445

In addition, the second claim limitation starting with "...deriving at an end-user site..." is written with conditional elements (i) or (ii). The examiner has already addressed element (i). All the elements of the TV-Anytime CRID and the *Koike* reference are all part of element (ii), which can be disregarded under the OR condition. Nevertheless, the examiner will briefly address the issues raised within the remarks. Applicant's representative stated that it is unknown how *Koike's* usage of CRID can be applied to the whole limitation. The examiner has tried to show that *Koike's* teachings of the CRID can be easily and readily combined within *Marshall's* and *Goldman's* teachings of the EPG, as the CRID is related to identifying the content or materials (i.e., title of the program), to teach as a whole and cover all the aspects of that particular limitation. The teachings of the EPG and the peer ID are provided within the first two references as previously stated and presented.

In addition on a separate note, all the terms such as deriving, responsive, and enabling are all still very vague and open to interpretation during and throughout the examination of the claims.

Please clarify and amend accordingly.

/X. Y./

Examiner, Art Unit 2445